

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
1.	Questions #3, 4, 42 & Amendment 001	In Amendment 001, Section L.24(d) was updated to state "(\$15M Total)," but Section B.2(d) was not updated per the new estimated cost to show \$15 Million. These items are now mismatched and lead to an incorrect total estimated value in B.2(e). Also, A new L-8 Total Cost worksheet was not included in the update provided in Amendment 001. The current worksheet does not include CLIN 004, which means that L-8 Total Cost understates the value proposed. Because of these issues, we never report the correct contract value as part of the cost volume. Please correct.	Please see Amendment 002, issued November 2, 2015. Amendment 003 will include a revised L-8 worksheet.
2.	Question #57	<p>A) If awarded, we anticipate taking over incumbent software. Please provide the name(s) of who owns the leases and licenses.</p> <p>B) Has any of the software been certified by DCAA? If so, which software?</p> <p>C) Provide details on the functions of all software on the list posted in the library."</p>	The additional information requested is not required for proposal preparation.
3.	Question #77	DOE's response seems to suggest that the materials of construction of the distributor plates were changed. What are the current materials of construction for the distributor plates?	Please see the TIP action report summary provided to the bidders on a CD using the Sensitive Data process.

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
4.	Question #77	How are the distributor plates made with the new material performing?	Please see the TIP action report summary provided to the bidders on a CD using the Sensitive Data process.
5.	Question #77	How many distributor plates have been changed?	Please see the TIP action report summary provided to the bidders on a CD using the Sensitive Data process.
6.	Question #77	Is the replacement of any additional distributor plates expected? If yes, will DOE provide a drawing of this highly specialized component?	Please see the TIP action report summary provided to the bidders on a CD using the Sensitive Data process.
7.	Question #77	Was there any information on the physical, chemical or radiochemical makeup of the deposits on the former/original distributor plate material prior to the recent change?	Please see the TIP action report summary provided to the bidders on a CD using the Sensitive Data process.
8.	Question #89	When can offerors expect that the additional workload in Attachment J-8.C.3.2 Table 1 be provided?	A revised Attachment J-8.C.3.2 Table 1 was included in Amendment 002.
9.	Question #132	Sections C.6.10 and C.6.10.1 remain in conflict following the update of Section C in Amendment 001. Please resolve.	Please see Amendment 002, issued November 2, 2015.
10.	Question #137	DOE states - "Clause H.34 states the types and minimum amounts of insurance that shall be maintained by the Contractor in accordance with the clause DEAR 952.231-71, Insurance - Litigation and Claims." Please clarify that the third party liabilities that would be reimbursed under the provisions of this clause would include any liabilities arising from performance of the scope of work under the Fixed Price CLIN as well as the scopes that would	The third party liabilities that would be reimbursed under the provisions of this clause would include any liabilities arising from performance of the scope of work under the Fixed Price CLIN as well as the scopes that would be performed under the Cost-reimbursed CLINs.

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
		performed under the Cost-reimbursed CLINs.	
11.	Question #140	The referenced software in Answer # 140 is not listed in the referenced attachment, is this cost reimbursable?	The referenced software are for the sole use of the ISS contractor, are not cost reimbursable and are not included in Attachment J-8.C.3.3 Table 3. DOE is limiting cost reimbursable software to that which is predominantly used by more than just a single contractor on site.
12.	Questions #160 and #179	Bidders must perform work to a detailed Transition Operations Plan (TOP) schedule, submitted with the proposal and approved prior to NTP. Inclusion of a compliant schedule in Volume II requires a large number of pages counted against the 75-page total—up to 10% of total pages—yet this item represents far less than 10% of the total Criterion 2 evaluation score. Length is driven by Section C.3.4, which requires that the schedule include specified activities and deliverables. A duplicate of the transition schedule is also included in Volume III. Therefore, we request that when also presented in Volume II TOP, this schedule be covered by the page limitation exclusion for Volume II schedules specified in L.21(f). Is this approach compliant?	If it is part of the Transition Operations Plan (TOP) it is NOT excluded from the page count.

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
13.	Questions #162, 169, 218, 219, and 222	Please confirm that providing the L-2s in table form in 10-point type is acceptable to DOE and compliant.	DOE will accept any approach to filling the form as long as the font size is no smaller than 12 point, the form is complete (meaning all questions are answered) and as long as each form does not exceed 7 pages.
14.	Question #174	The Offeror shall describe the proposed approach for routine cylinder yard operations including, but not limited to, implementation of the cylinder surveillance and maintenance plan in conformance with requirements of Section C.7. Should the bidders address all of the work scope elements performed in the cylinder yards required to select, inspect, and deliver cylinders for conversion operations in addition to C.7 S&M scope.	Yes; all work scope in the PWS must be addressed. Please also see work scope in Section C.4.
15.	Question #175	In response to Q&A #3, Item 175, DOE stated that "Section J-8 will be revised to be consistent with Section L.23 in an upcoming amendment." However, in Amendment 001, DOE did not update Section J-8 to change when the Transition Operations Plan is due. Will DOE issue another amendment that incorporates this change?	The referenced revision will be made in Amendment 003.
16.	Question #189 and 193	The response to Q&A #4, Item 189, states "DOE-provided costs are reflective of budgeted costs in 2014-2015. As stated in L.24(h)(x), annual escalation factor s 2.8% for both direct labor and other than labor costs." This response	DOE provided costs shall not be escalated for the duration of the solicitation; therefore, Offeror(s) shall propose the same DOE provided cost dollars in each fiscal year. Escalation is applicable to all other proposed cost.

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
		indicates the Offeror should use 2.8% to escalate the costs in L.24(d). However, the response to Q&A #4, Item 193, states “DOE-provided costs are reflective of budgeted costs in 2014-2015. Offeror(s) shall use the DOE provided dollar amounts as stated in the L.24(d) applying no escalation to the provided dollar amounts for out-years.” This response indicates that Offerors should NOT escalate costs in L.24(d). Please clarify.	
17.	Question #204	Instructions to offerors, section L.24 states that we need to provide the BOEs by Attachment L-10, which implies that the BOEs will be prepared by WBS. However in the same paragraph it then says that the BOEs need to be written by PWS by cost element. Can you please clarify if the BOEs are to be done by WBS or PWS?	The bases of estimates and cost information shall be organized by the WBS dictionary in Attachment L-10. The referenced cost instructions will be modified in Amendment 003.
18.	Questions #206, 236-241, 243-248 Attachment L-10 Revision	DOE stated Attachment L-10 would be modified in response to Q&A #4, Items 206, 236-241, and 243-248. Does DOE intend to release an additional amendment to incorporate these changes?	Please see Amendment 002, issued November 2, 2015.
19.	Amendment 002	Attachment L-9: Please confirm that the "Operator Technician" and the Electrical/General/Instrument Maintenance Technician listed in Category C are USW	Yes.

**Operation of DUF6 Conversion Facilities
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0007016
Answers to Clarification Questions #1**

Clarification Question No.	Original Question Number	Industry Question	DOE Answer
		positions and that we should use the Category C Rates plus 55% for benefits in our cost proposal for these USW personnel.	
20.	Documents Library	<p>DUF6 Project Positions by Job Title Should we now use the project position titles listed in this document for our staffing plans and Volume III costing?</p> <p>If so, a number of the positions do not map back to a number of non-management positions labor category rates, i.e., “Category A”, “Category B”, “Category C”, “Category D”, “Category E” in attachment L-9. Could DOE provide the mapping to L-9 or allow the Offerors to pick L-9 rate categories based upon our judgement?</p> <p>We believe it would be more consistent for DOE to designate labor categories for each position.</p>	Offerors’ proposed position titles should be consistent with the proposed organization.
21.	Documents Library	DOE provided a new document entitled "Summary of Major Modifications Made to DUF6 Systems". The term "Major Modification" has a specific meaning per DOE STD-1189-2008. Can DOE please clarify which, if any, of these modifications were determined to be a major modification in accordance with this standard?	The adjective “major” was not intended to be used in the context of DOE-STD-1189-2008.